UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,878	09/28/2001	Michael Patrick Bushe	EMC01-12(01047)	4264

7590   02/09/2005

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER
PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/966,878	BUSHE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 September 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 09/17/2004.

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 17, 30, and 31 are

independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claim 26 was amended. This action is

made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 17, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1).

As per independent claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that in a computer system for

managing resources, a method for displaying managed object data associated with

managed resources, the method comprising the steps of receiving at least one

managed object selection and receiving a task selection to apply to the at least one

managed object selection (column 1, 12-16 and 31-34, *i.e. – selecting network objects and performing network management functions on these objects*); identifying at least one view definition corresponding to the task selection that defines a view with which to display managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection (column 9, lines 12-15 and 49-52); displaying the view corresponding to the at least one view definition on a graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9, lines 49- 52); obtaining the managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection (column 4, lines 59-67 and column 10, lines 10-13); and displaying the managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection within the view on the graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9, lines 49-52).

Claims 17, 30, and 31 are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Besaw (US 20020198973A1).

As per independent claim 14, Besaw teaches that in a management server computer system, a method providing access to managed object data, the method comprising the steps of parsing a view definitions document, an object definitions document and an object data document to create a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view definitions and managed object data definitions, the data dictionary further defining, for each task definition, at least one use case that defines a mapping of at least one view definition to a portion of at least one managed

object data definition (¶26-30, *i.e. – customized management services and views*, and

¶49); detecting an initiation of a resource management process (¶46); and passing the

data dictionary to the resource management process to allow the resource management

process to process the data dictionary (¶46, *i.e. – accessing a database to find*

customer portals).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Besaw teaches the steps of

receiving a request from a resource management process for managed object data

associated with a particular managed resource (¶29-30, *i.e. – viewing information about*

networked objects); invoking operation of a resource agent operating in conjunction with

the managed resource to produce and return the managed object data (¶35); receiving

the managed object data from the resource agent; and providing the managed object

data to the resource management process (¶35).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Besaw teaches that the method

operates in a resource management application used for management of managed

resources in a storage area network environment (¶28) and wherein the view definitions

document, the object definitions document are XML documents defining task selections

that can be applied to managed object selections, and that further define, for certain

combinations of task selections and object selections, a use' case that references a

view definition that defines a view and references managed object data that is to be

displayed in the view according to a style definition (¶27 and ¶44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-13, 18-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1) in further view of

Besaw (US 20020198973A1).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Rangarajan in

regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Rangarajan does not disclose the steps

of: retrieving a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view

definitions and managed object data definitions, the data dictionary further defining, for

each task definition, at least one use case that defines a mapping of at least one view

definition to a portion of at least one managed object data definition; and displaying the

master view definition on the graphical user interface such that a user of the computer

system can provide the at least one managed object selection and a task selection that

are received in the step of receiving.

Besaw teaches the steps of: retrieving a data dictionary containing a master view

definition, task definitions, view definitions and managed object data definitions, the

data dictionary further defining, for each task definition, at least one use case that

defines a mapping of at least one view definition to a portion of at least one managed

object data definition (¶26-30, *i.e. – customized management services and views*, and

¶49); and displaying the master view definition on the graphical user interface such that

a user of the computer system can provide the at least one managed object selection

and a task selection that are received in the step of receiving (¶27). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the teachings of Rangarajan with the ability to store definitions of different tasks,

objects, and views, as taught by Besaw, with the motivation to display only relevant

information to a manager of a network (¶10).

Claims 18 and 32 are similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under

similar rationale.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the step of identifying at least one view definition corresponding

to the task selection comprises the steps of selecting a task definition in the data

dictionary that corresponds to the task selection (¶27); and for each of the at least one

object selection, selecting a use case that is associated with the task definition in the

data dictionary and that corresponds to the at least one object selection, the use case

identifying a view definition defining a view in which to display managed object data

related to the at least one managed object selection to which a management function

associated with the task selection is applied (¶27 and ¶31, *i.e. – selecting and defining*

user views).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the step of displaying the view definition comprises the steps of

for each of the at least one view definition identified in the step of identifying: i)

retrieving a view type from the at least one view definition in the data dictionary, the

view type defining a view to be displayed on the graphical user interface of the

computer system (column 9, lines 49-52); and ii) rendering a view corresponding to the

view type on the graphical user interface of the computer system (column 9-10, lines

59-5).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the step of rendering a view corresponding to the view type

renders the view according to a view style defined in the data dictionary (column 7, lines

42-61).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the view style defines a view corresponding to at least one of a

map, a tree and a graph (column 7, lines 45-56, *i.e. – a topology view*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data comprises the

steps of consulting the at least one view definition in the data dictionary to identify the

managed object data references related to the at least one managed object selection

that reference managed object data that is to be displayed in the view definition (column

9, lines 49-52); and obtaining the managed object data based upon managed object

data references (column 4, lines 59-67 and column 10, lines 10-13).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, the combination of Rangarajan

and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data includes the step

of determining if the managed object data is contained in the data dictionary, and if the

managed object data is contained in the data dictionary, the managed object data is

obtained from the data dictionary, and if the managed object data is not contained in the data dictionary, the managed object data is obtained from a management server that provides the managed object data (column 4, lines 10-13 and column 10, lines 10-13).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of obtaining the managed object data further comprises the steps of invoking a management function associated with the task selection upon managed object data associated with at least one of the at least one managed object selection to produce managed object data. which is referenced by the managed object data references defined within the view definition (¶27, *i.e. – management services*).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of displaying the managed object data comprises the steps of providing the view displayed on the graphical user interface of the computer system with the managed object data obtained as a result of the step of obtaining; and rendering the managed object data in the view (columns 9-10, lines 49-5).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the step of rendering the managed object data renders the managed object data according to a managed object data style defined in the data dictionary for the managed object data (column 7, lines 42-61).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 2, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the data dictionary is a document object model based upon parsing operations performed on a collection of markup language statements that define task definitions, view definitions, and object definitions (¶44 and ¶49).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw teach that the object definitions in the document object model define attributes and data of resources in a storage area network environment (¶44-46); the task definitions identify resource management functions which may be applied to the resources in the storage area network environment (¶44-46 and ¶27); and wherein the step of obtaining the managed object data includes the step of applying a resource management function associated with the task selection upon a resource in the storage area network environment corresponding to the managed object selection to produce managed object data which is referenced by the managed object data references defined within the view definition (¶27 and column 9-10, lines 59-5); and wherein the step of displaying the managed object data displays the managed object data in the graphical user interface to allow a user of the computer system to view results of application of the resource management function on the resources in storage area network environment (¶27 and column 9-10, lines 59-5).

Claims 19-29 are similar in scope to claims 3-13, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/17/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues:

a.   Rangarajan does not teach choosing a configuration based on the task selected to be performed on a selected object.

b.   Besaw does not teach creating a dictionary-type item from a definition-like document. Furthermore the creation of the user configuration file does not seem to be specified in Besaw.

In regards to argument (a), the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant that Rangarajan does not teach choosing a configuration based on the task selected to be performed on a selected object. The Examiner would like to point out that the task of managing can be a task in itself. Therefore when the user selects the "just-routers" in figure 9 the task that is being performed is configuring the display to further manage the routers. The routers are the managed objects and the task is to manage them.

In regards to argument (b), the Examiner disagrees with the applicant that Besaw does not teach creating a dictionary-type item from a definition-like document. Besaw teaches "The management information portal 134 may be configured to provide customized management services to the customers 120 by referencing a customer views module 136. The customer views module may be configured to maintain a database of the types of services available to each customer in response to being authenticated into the management portal 130" (¶27). This database is a dictionary-type configuration file because it defines services available to the customer amongst other information.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100